DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 839 24 HE 002 092

TITLE	Toward an Agenda for a National Planning Effort in Higher Education; Phase I. Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0797
PUB DATE	30 Jun 69
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-980797-4634 (010)
NOTE	46p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Coordination, *Educational Planning, Federal Government, *Higher Education, *Planning, *Problems, Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

The Academy for Educational Development was requested by the Bureau of Research in the Office of Education to look into planning for higher education in the U.S. and to make recommendations as to whether in the future some planning for higher education should be conducted on a nationwide basis and, if so, what type of organization might be responsible for conducting the planning. This interim report discusses some of the major findings from the field work. These findings include: (1) there is extensive general interest in the idea of national planning for higher education; (2) the most successful planning is carried out by some state coordinating agencies and regional organizations; (3) there is a great deal of planning by the institutions of higher learning, but the quality of these efforts is uneven; (4) major federal programs affecting higher education are carried out in the absence of any coherent set of national policies or plans; (5) a serious handicap to long-range planning is the lack of available data on current needs and costs, and on alternative strategies; and (6) college officials are thwarted in their planning efforts by conflicting views on how to meet societal problems and cope with student unrest. (AF)

BR-8-0797
PA-24

ED048839

TOWARD AN AGENDA FOR A NATIONAL PLANNING EFFORT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 092

INTERIM REPORT

PHASE I

JUNE 30, 1969

THE ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.
1424 Sixteenth St., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

BR 8-0797
PA 24

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.
437 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022
(212) 758-5454

Interim Report

OE Bureau of Research No.
None

Contract No.
OEC-0-8-980797-4634(010)

Period: July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969

Date of Submission: June 30, 1969

Name of Institution: Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
1424 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C., 20036

Title of Project: Establishment of a National Planning Congress

Name of Project Directors:

Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, President
Mr. Sidney G. Tickton, Executive Vice President
Mr. Rexford G. Moon, Jr., Vice President

Office of Education Division or Staff Office:

Bureau of Research, Division of Higher Education Research

Certification

_____
Signature of Contract Officer

_____
Date

Rexford G. Moon, Jr.
Signature of Principal Investigator or Project Director

June 30, 1969
Date

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.
437 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022
(212) 758-5454

June 30, 1969

Dr. James E. Allen, Jr.
United States Commissioner of Education
United States Office of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Commissioner Allen:

About a year ago the Bureau of Research of the United States Office of Education asked the Academy for Educational Development to look into the planning for higher education in the United States. Specifically, we were to examine the status of planning and to make recommendations as to whether in the future at least some planning for higher education should be conducted on a nationwide basis and, if so, what type of organization or body might be responsible for conducting this planning. This work is being carried out under contract number OEO-0-8-980797-4634(010).

The final report of the first phase of this study containing findings, recommendations, and appropriate documentation is due December 31, 1969. Our expectation at this time is that a draft of this report can be delivered to you somewhat earlier, possibly by October 15, 1969 or thereabouts.

In the meantime, we believe you will be interested in our major findings from the field work which has just been completed. These have been incorporated into an interim report which follows.

This report has been made possible through the participation of literally hundreds of university and college officials, of a great many government leaders, and of many leaders of major associations and other groups who met with our staff and consultants. (See Appendix B, "Study Procedures and Material Collected.") We have also had the benefit of the continued guidance and assistance provided

by key personnel in the Bureau of Research of the Office of Education. We are particularly grateful to Dr. David Pollen, Deputy Director, Bureau of Research and his two associates, Dr. Chester Neudling and Dr. Adolph J. Koenig.

I would welcome an opportunity to discuss our findings with you and answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Alvin C. Eurich
President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....A

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS.....B

APPENDICES

Next Steps.....C

Study Procedures and Materials Collected.....D

Consultants and Staff.....E

Board of Directors, Academy for Educational Development.....F

A

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. Interest in the general idea of national planning for higher education is extensive, although divergent opinions as to what a national planning effort should try to accomplish have yet to be reconciled. Some educators question whether a national planning effort should, in fact, be undertaken, but a sizable segment of the higher-education community views it as a desirable next step.

2. The most successful planning for higher education is carried out by some state coordinating agencies and regional organizations.

3. There is a great deal of planning for higher education by colleges and universities, but the overall quality of these efforts is uneven.

4. Major federal programs affecting higher education are carried

out in the absence of any coherent set of national policies or national plans. A number of proposals have called for increased coordination among federal programs, and between federal programs and those of state governments. Educational leaders have suggested that the federal government take the initiative in establishing a set of national policies and plans for higher education.

5. A serious handicap to planning for the future of higher education is the lack of available data on current needs and costs of higher education, and on alternative strategies and their effect on meeting these needs and supporting these costs.

6. College and university officials are thwarted in their planning efforts by conflicting views of how they should concern themselves with problems of society, and by immediate campus concerns, especially student unrest.

B

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

In spite of the upheaval on college campuses today, many educators are finding it possible to extend their horizons by planning for the future. They are planning for more of everything -- more students, more faculty, more buildings, and more equipment. They are beginning to think about new approaches to learning, and about alliances that would extend the benefits of education. They are thinking about how much this expansion will cost, and where the money will come from. They are wondering in what situation the convulsions of contemporary America will leave them, and how they can alleviate the conditions that have led to such turmoil. Far-sighted leaders are writing plans that help them to build strong educational institutions and programs with a clear sense of purpose. Increasingly, however, they have come to realize that the nature of many of their problems transcends institutional or even regional boundaries and must be viewed in a national perspective, and that this perspective might be provided by a national planning policy.

FINDING #1

Interest in the general idea of national planning for higher education

is extensive, although divergent opinions as to what a national planning effort should try to accomplish have yet to be reconciled. Some educators question whether a national planning effort should, in fact, be undertaken, but a sizable segment of the higher-education community views it as a desirable next step.

Interest in national planning for higher education is demonstrated by organizations already established which have a broad study function related to national planning or which are concerned with furthering change and innovation in higher education on a nationwide basis. Among these are the Education Commission of the States, the Federal Inter-Agency Committee on Education, the U. S. Office of Education's Policy Research Centers, and the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education. In addition, a number of new agencies have been recommended in the past year. These include the National Institutes of Education proposed at a recent meeting of the American Educational Research Association; Higher Education Incorporated and Citizens for Higher Education, both proposed by the president of the Association of American Colleges; the Council on Federal Relations, being developed by the American Association of Universities; the National Council on Higher Learning proposed by the Report of

the Advisory Committee on Higher Education to the Secretary of HEW (Wescoe Report). Also, the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education has recommended the establishment of a Presidential Council of Advisors on Higher Education, and a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education. Alan Pifer, President of the Carnegie Corporation, has suggested the creation of a "focal point" for higher education, close to the summit of the federal government. An extra-governmental National Commission on Higher Education has been proposed by the Danforth Foundation, to be an autonomous organization affiliated with the American Council on Education. This commission would try to develop public understanding of the issues in higher education, to offset the divisions among colleges and universities, to identify and analyze high priority questions, and to propose programs and solutions on the basis of their work.

Among the strongest advocates of national planning for higher education are a number of economists concerned with the educational process and its effects on the nation's economy and well-being. These economists want to preserve the power of states, local governments, and individual institutions to make decisions affecting higher education; at the same time they look to a national planning effort as a means of

giving direction to the growing number of federal programs influencing what happens in colleges and universities. In their view, a research-based analytical organization for national planning in higher education could do two things: attempt to improve the basis for determining federal policy toward higher education, and help to improve decision-making in colleges and universities by providing them with better information about the consequences of alternative actions.

In colleges and universities there is an unresolved conflict between the recognized necessity of long-range, large-scale planning at the state and federal level to preserve educational diversity, and, on the other hand, the implied threat of such planning to that very diversity.

One cause for this conflict in the minds of educators is that in practice there has been a failure within the states to adequately distinguish between planning, coordination, and control. This leads to the concern voiced by representatives of colleges and universities that national planning will result in federal control and will reduce educational diversity, and freedom of action on the individual campus.

Many suggestions were received from representatives of colleges and universities concerning the organization and functions of a national planning effort. These recommended functions can be catalogued as advisory, representative, coordinating, research, and informative. Many small private institutions and some public colleges favor relatively strong national organization in the hopes of improving their lot within the total educational community. Colleges and universities already in a strong position tend to favor less regulatory, more advisory and research-directed efforts. Many administrators look to a national planning effort as a mechanism for solving immediate problems, some of which might not be directly or even properly related to national planning.

The diversity of these views indicates the extent of the confusion as to what national planning is. Some educational leaders would like to see a national planning effort consist of a lobbying mechanism; others feel it should issue comprehensive policy statements hammered out by a group of distinguished educational experts; still others believe that it would be most effective if it were constituted as a central research and analysis organization with a national viewpoint. Concurrent with the development of any national planning organization

must come a resolution of this conflict and a new understanding as to which areas of planning are properly the province of the institutions, the states, and the federal government.

FINDING #2

The most successful planning for higher education is carried out by some state coordinating agencies and regional organizations.

Academy investigations indicate that the best of these plans are characterized by the involvement in planning of the decision-makers representing all segments of higher education, as well as by a recognition of the relationships that exist between all major parts of the educational process, from educational goals and instructional techniques to finance and administration. Plans such as those of California and New York State offer support for research, innovation and experimentation, and built-in means by which the results may be evaluated. These plans recognize the need for pluralism in higher education, and make communications easier between higher-education institutions and the public.

The best state planning agencies have served to lessen the tensions that exist between the various kinds of higher-education institutions, and between the institutions and the public. These agencies have provided legislators with information leading to a more knowledgeable balancing of needs against costs, and an increased ability to evaluate the validity of special interests. In these states, such efforts have

resulted in more equitable legislation for the continuing support of colleges and universities. By documenting areas of weakness and need within higher education, these efforts have paved the way for more comprehensive and effective planning for the future.

In discharging their responsibilities to the public as well as to colleges and universities, state planners have developed alternatives that might reduce costs, have recommended the establishment of facilities and programs in areas of state need, and (as is also true in a limited number of higher-education institutions) have encouraged innovative approaches to higher education in an effort to make it more readily available and adaptable to greater and more diverse numbers of Americans.

The activities of some leading regional organizations for higher education have illuminated a number of problems common to all colleges and universities within the region, indicating the possible benefit of similar activities at the national level. In addition to their encouragement of all kinds of interinstitutional cooperation, regional agencies can collect and analyze information helpful both to higher-education institutions and to legislatures in their planning efforts.

FINDING #3

There is a great deal of planning for higher education by colleges and universities, but the overall quality of these efforts is uneven.

The most comprehensive planning is done by large public universities. The rate of growth and sheer size of many state university systems has required a degree of planning not usually found in smaller institutions. Because large public universities are strong in relation to other segments of higher education, their spokesmen often have greater influence with representatives of state government. As a result, the plans at such universities can in many cases be put into effect with fewer of the frustrations encountered at weaker institutions. At the large public universities sizable planning staffs have been assembled to collect and analyze data, usually with the extensive assistance of computers. The most successful planning efforts are those in which top administrators have assumed the responsibility for and participated in the total planning process.

Most large public universities are planning for expansion of almost all programs. This represents a continuation of the pattern in recent years and, even though this expansion is sometimes in conflict with the plans of state coordinating agencies, experience indicates that

the pattern will continue. In many cases this expansion must go forward without extensive documentation of costs, sources of funds, or alternatives that might reduce costs. There is the clear implication that needs are so urgent as to obviate requirements for extensive supportive data. At the large public universities it is assumed that the federal government must and will support a large part of this expansion.

Planning efforts of the state colleges are less well-developed than those of the large public universities because to a much greater extent their management and direction is guided from the state capital. As a result, state colleges tend to regard planning as direction imposed from the outside. Including representatives of these colleges in statewide planning encourages results that are more directly responsive to institutional problems. In states where such representation exists, the presidents of the state colleges, convinced of the efficacy of planning on the state level, are more favorable to the idea of national planning.

As a recent phenomenon, two year community colleges are relatively free from the guidelines imposed by tradition and past customs, and rely to a far greater extent on comprehensive planning. Their purpose

of serving the local community and providing opportunities to those who might not otherwise be able to go to college requires them to integrate their programs and planning with community needs and support. At the same time they must be closely attuned to the rest of public higher education in a state, chiefly because many of their students intend to transfer to four-year colleges. The most successful planning efforts for community colleges, therefore, are those that reflect this dual integration.

Institutional planning by private higher-education institutions varies greatly in quality and quantity. The relatively few wealthy institutions have the confidence to chart their own courses, and the funds and administrators to conceive and carry out plans. Outstanding plans have evolved at many small institutions fortunate in having farsighted leaders who not only believe in the need for planning but have themselves actively participated in the process. Many private college and university presidents, however, are so concerned with the question of survival that they have no time or energy left to give to thoughts about the future. Finally, all private institutions of higher education are better able to plan for the future when, in proper recognition of their efforts in behalf of the public good, they are included in state and federal planning processes for public higher education.

FINDING #4

Major federal programs affecting higher education are carried out in the absence of any coherent set of national policies or national plans. A number of proposals have called for increased coordination among federal programs, and between federal programs and those of state governments. Educational leaders have suggested that the federal government take the initiative in establishing a set of national policies and plans for higher education.

A century ago the Morrill Acts created the land-grant colleges, and in doing so greatly influenced the future of American higher education. Recent legislative acts, of the magnitude of the Higher Education Facilities Act, are now affecting the development of higher education in what may prove to be even more profound ways. These acts have provided more money for higher education than the total achieved by all previous federal legislation. The support was badly needed and for that reason greatly welcomed. But the acts followed one another with such speed that there was no time to develop basic policy. Through the mechanisms they established to distribute aid, the acts themselves began to create policy, rather than serving it. A kind of federal control was thereby established, but a control that operated

without overall, consistent direction. It is the argument of many that since control already exists, it would be far better to establish a rational basis for it.

Within the existing federal structure there has been to date no real attempt to create an overall policy. The projections of agencies involved in planning for higher education seem to be largely short term, with a distinct lack of coordination between one agency and another. Academy investigations turned up few published or written materials that could be called planning documents. Aside from actual agency budgets, the only documents that can be legitimately called plans are those prepared for use in appropriation testimony or for legislative amendments, and in many cases these are limited in scope to the agency preparing them. Agencies have their own interests to protect and are not set up to consider the overall situation in higher education. The time and effort that must be given to securing appropriations from annual budgets quite naturally encourages agencies to think in terms of one year at a time; this further discourages any kind of long-range planning, since the chances for any kind of implementation are never known in advance.

The Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE) was created by Executive Order in 1964 to better coordinate education activities among the more than 40 federal agencies sponsoring educational programs. The Committee, acting in an advisory capacity to the Secretary of HEW, the Commissioner of Education, and the heads of other federal agencies, has concerned itself with (a) the effects of federal activities on state, local and private educational programs, (b) the resolution of differences in policy and practice associated with federal educational programs, and (c) the collection of overview data with respect to federal education activities. The large number of agencies represented and the wide-ranging functions of the Committee could make it useful in the support of national planning within the federal government.

Several other proposals have been advanced for achieving a rational ordering of policies. For example, Alan Pifer, President of the Carnegie Corporation, in early 1968 proposed the creation of a new kind of "focal point" or "center" for higher education, close to the summit of the federal government and designed to influence all federal action impinging on higher education. Such a center would be charged with the responsibility for long-range planning, for devising a set of national policies, for keeping open the lines of communication

and cooperation with the states and the representatives of higher education in general, and for safeguarding the interests of colleges and universities in instances where they are affected by federal action in any form. Pifer recommends that the center be presided over by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, although not necessarily located within his department.

An agency with fewer operational responsibilities but a wider range of research and deliberative functions was proposed by the Wescoe Report, commissioned by the Secretary of HEW and issued in mid-1968. The role of this proposed National Council on Higher Learning would be to provide for continuous monitoring, assessment and planning of higher education in America. A principal objective of its work would be the development of better communication between higher education and the federal government. This objective would be furthered through three principal functions of the Council: (a) communication and deliberation; (b) research and data-gathering; and (c) the assessment of priorities and the adequacy of existing policies, as based on its research and deliberations.

The endorsement of the Wescoe Report by the Education Commission of the States indicates growing acceptance of the need for national

planning. In its Federal Legislative Proposals, 1969, the Commission suggests a few specific ideas as to the representational makeup of such a National Council on Higher Learning that would best serve to achieve the desired "overview". It suggests that the major federal agencies involved in higher education activities be represented, and that in order to increase the likelihood of the implementation of its recomendations, the Secretary himself should serve as Chairman, with the additional participation of the Commissioner of Education, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and representatives of congressional leadership. Leading educators should be included in order to command the confidence of institutions of higher education. Finally, in recognition of the importance of the states in providing both the resources and the leadership for carrying out national objectives, the Commission recommended that the Council should include state representation.

FINDING #5

A serious handicap to planning for the future of higher education is the lack of available data on current needs and costs of higher education, and on alternative strategies and their effect on meeting these needs and supporting these costs.

An initial problem is that, because of inadequate dissemination, whatever data may already exist is not reaching those individuals and agencies responsible for making decisions. This is true within the federal government, among the states, and at the colleges and universities themselves. The separation between the planning and operational units of the federal agencies contributes to poor distribution of existing data, as does the lapse in time between the submission by institutions of various data and its return in analyzed form. The ERIC system has failed to fulfill the expectations of a large number of educators concerned with day-to-day institutional management and planning. As a result, no efficient system exists for giving wide distribution to the results of successful experiments on the institutional level. Many institutions discover belatedly that the model for a new educational program which they have spent a great deal of time and money developing already exists at another institution. A national planning agency, it was felt, could

provide an immensely valuable service if it were able to collect and disseminate such information on an efficient and concise basis.

The kinds of data necessary to the development of effective national planning are currently being collected and analyzed chiefly by a number of research organizations and testing services -- agencies such as the Brookings Institution, the College Entrance Examination Board, and the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. The present concern of these organizations is with what might be described as ingredients of planning rather than with the actual planning process. Many agencies explicitly state that their own work is not directly related to planning; some of the major agencies are not focusing primarily on questions of higher education. It is reasonable to expect, however, that many of the concepts, methodologies and findings could be applied to the study of planning in higher education without loss of validity.

Much current research in higher education focuses on the student. Some of these projects deal specifically with the effort to more accurately describe, understand and record the characteristics of college-going individuals. The researchers interviewed felt that similar studies of faculty members would be a stimulant to more productive faculty-student relationships, and that continuing

research into student concerns, especially as to the means for stimulating their motivation and aspirations, could provide valuable data for formulating objectives for higher education.

Many current projects of these organizations concentrate on aspects of finance in higher education. Some of them focus on the problem of more satisfactory sharing of financial responsibility, others on possible future patterns and alternatives of financing. An on-going study of the impact on the student of federal aid programs could help to clarify the debate over the best means of dispensing federal aid. The impact of various kinds of aid, not only on students but on institutions, states, etc., is felt to be an area of prime importance in future investigations. Several researchers see a need for comprehensive studies, as well, of the economic returns to society of providing higher education for an increasingly greater proportion of the population.

A smaller number of projects are centered upon the teaching/learning process, with special emphasis upon the use of technological and other aids to achieve greater individualization of instruction as well as increased teacher effectiveness. Before higher education can validly plan for change, however, much more needs to be known about the learning process, in the opinion of the research

community. Those interviewed feel such research must be directed toward students who fall below the median in test scores, class rank, and family income level. The results of research in this area should provide the basis for constructing more appropriate programs and instructional methods.

There is little evidence of research into new forms or models of higher education and their organization. Results of such research would be especially relevant to any major effort to appraise the impact of universal higher education on the nation. There is also little thorough researching and analysis of the complex problems arising out of the rapid shifts in power among governing boards, administrators, faculty senates, faculty unions, student organizations, and extra-institutional groups. There is a lack of the kind of information required to determine the extent to which accrediting agencies force institutions into conformity, or, conversely, allow and encourage innovative changes. Changes in individual disciplines, and in the relationship between departments as a result of individualized study or the creation of new centers and institutes, are little understood. Very little is known about what really works and what does not among the many new programs of instruction (some of them very experimental in nature) now being offered, or among the

new configurations of governance and administration being explored.

There is a need to investigate these areas in order to provide the broad data base and the depth of understanding necessary to the creation of useful alternatives for higher education, and to find ways that will assure proper dissemination not only of such new material but of the data that already exists.

FINDING #6

College and university officials are thwarted in their planning efforts by conflicting views of how they should concern themselves with problems of society, and by immediate campus concerns, especially student unrest.

Colleges and universities are caught up in conflicts and issues beyond their walls. Higher education is increasingly dependent on public funds for its continued existence, and is therefore held increasingly accountable to the public sector for the expenditure of these and other funds. Recent congressional attempts to control student unrest through tighter regulation of federal support is one obvious example of the extent of federal influence. Subtler but more pervasive effects on institutional policy derive from the kinds of higher educational activities that public funds sanction and the manner in which support for them is disbursed.

There is a growing understanding of the relation between higher education and the well-being of the nation and its citizens. With this understanding comes the demand from the public sector for greater sophistication in creating new programs and institutions, more closely related to needs. In the absence of guidelines provided by

a comprehensive plan, many institutions have hastily adopted programs to accommodate these demands. They are now finding that their institutional goals have been subtly redirected, and their financial resources overtaxed.

Colleges and universities are in a turmoil as to how they should react to these pressures within the context of their institutional objectives. This uncertainty hinders certain of their planning efforts, such as enrollment and financial projections, because the assumptions on which these projections are made no longer seem valid. However, in a larger sense, pressures for change can further planning efforts by acting as a spur to the re-examination by colleges and universities of their goals. The most comprehensive planning processes provide a framework within which these insistent demands can receive due consideration along with other, less intrusive but no less important educational questions.

A P P E N D I C E S

NEXT STEPS

This is the interim report for Phase I. A draft of the final report for this phase is due about October 15, 1969. At that time the Academy will present its recommendations with respect to national planning for higher education. These will include, but not be restricted to:

1. Recommendations on the need for and the creation and operation of one or more agencies, councils or congresses to carry out planning and to support policy development for higher education on a nationwide basis.

2. Recommendations on arrangements for national policy and planning research undertakings which should be carried out in support of national planning for higher education.

3. Recommendations on meeting the needs for professional personnel to staff planning positions in colleges and universities in the states and at the national level.

4. Recommendations on how federal agencies could assist in strengthening planning efforts at the national level, at the state level, and in the colleges and universities.

5. Recommendations on the next steps to be taken in this project including, if appropriate, an outline of activities to be undertaken and procedures to be followed.

The Academy expects to continue to work closely with members of the Office of Education as it prepares the final report for Phase I.

STUDY PROCEDURES AND MATERIALS COLLECTED

This preliminary report covers a period of approximately twelve months of the eighteen months which have been alloted for the first phase of a four-phase project. It is anticipated that this project will enter Phase II in January 1970 and that Phase II, contingent upon further negotiations, will last twelve to eighteen months. The same is true for phases III and IV.

Activities undertaken in this initial phase were developed primarily to accomplish four things considered essential to the successful realization of the complex and comprehensive objectives of this four-phase project. Considered essential were:

1. Providing an opportunity for higher education leaders to become involved in identifying the issues and problems for which planning should be undertaken at the national level.

2. Acquainting the key leaders of higher education in government, in institutions, at the state level, and in the

associations and elsewhere with the long-range possibilities for a national planning effort, in order to encourage their enthusiastic support for the four phases of this project.

3. Appraising the capabilities for planning, as well as the extent of planning related research in the nation's higher-education institutions, research centers, government agencies, etc.

4. Evaluating various proposals which have been made for agencies (for planning, coordinating or policy-making) at the national level in order to strengthen higher education in the years ahead.

The initial phase of this project followed immediately upon the issuing of two widely publicized proposals (Pifer and Wescoe) for the establishment of national higher-education agencies. The national announcement of this project produced expressions of concern, especially among the national associations and within various government departments. This made it essential for the Academy to focus a great deal of attention in Phase I on achieving wide national coverage and broad involvement of the higher-education community.

The findings in this report are based on data obtained through a variety of activities. By the completion of this project the Academy will have:

1. Conducted a series of special meetings in Washington, D.C., New York City, Denver, and Pittsburgh to brief the nation's leaders of higher education, including the heads of major institutions; the leaders of key organizations, societies, and associations; government officials; and others, on the purposes of the project, the steps to be followed and the assistance required.

2. Recruited, briefed and trained a temporary staff of professional, technical, and clerical personnel to carry out various assignments including the conducting of seminars, the preparation of reports, the interviewing of key officials, the preparation and conducting of surveys, the development of materials, etc.

3. Organized, invited participants, and conducted some 85 seminars throughout the country for presidents, deans, and other key officials of the nation's colleges and universities. These seminars, the first of their kind ever held

in the country, were devoted to the identification and discussion of the major issues requiring planning in higher education and of the possible models for national planning agencies. Seminars were organized separately for:

a. Private two- and four-year colleges and private universities, to which all institutions were invited.

b. State colleges and universities, to which all institutions were invited.

c. Land-grant colleges and universities, to which all institutions were invited.

d. Public community and junior colleges, to which a selected group was invited.

4. Recorded, summarized and evaluated the various seminars.

5. Requested, collected and assembled from many of the nation's colleges and universities and from the various states samples of planning reports and activities, information about personnel responsible for planning, and copies of actual planning documents.

6. Participated in a USOE-sponsored two-day research conference for the Future of Higher Education held in Washington, D. C., December 2 and 3, 1968. Offered to appear before meetings of various national organizations and associations.

7. Contacted and interviewed the key officials concerned with programs for higher education in major federal agencies, obtaining from these various agencies, where appropriate, copies of planning documents and reactions to the idea of and procedures for a national planning activity for higher education.

8. Collected and analyzed reports, professional articles and statements concerning the establishment of various types of agencies at the national or federal level for planning and/or policy development in the area of higher education.

9. Collected and analyzed for use as general background various reports, models, papers, and statements relative to the planning of higher education in the nation in the years ahead.

10. Reviewed various proposed models for general federal support for higher education and recruited a group of economists to provide advice to the project.

11. Provided oral progress reports on November 4, 1968 to Drs. Molnar and Neudling, to Drs. Neudling, Koenig, et al, on March 7, 1969, to Drs. Pollen, Neudling and Koenig on May 14, 1969 and on June 2, 1969.

12. Conducted a number of meetings with heads of state higher education coordinating agencies, governing boards and councils concerning the problems of the states in planning and their possible future relationship to national planning activities.

13. Assembled the necessary data and produced a comprehensive document describing for each of the fifty states the duties, functions, and responsibilities of the various agencies in each state which have overall planning responsibilities for higher education and of such additional agencies as may be responsible for student assistance, vocational education, facilities construction, etc. Each of the states provided the complete data as well as copies

of any plans which may have been developed. The tentative title is Higher Education in the Fifty States.

14. Collected and analyzed the key recommendations concerning higher education contained in various major reports, dating back to the report of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education and including -- but not limited to -- the Eisenhower Task Force on Higher Education; the Report of the President's Commission on Goals; the two most recent White House Conferences on Education; the report of the Carnegie Commission on the Future of Higher Education, entitled Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education; the report to the President by the Secretary of HEW, entitled Toward a Long-Range Plan for Federal Support for Higher Education; and other significant reports.

15. Prepared for the nation's governors, at the behest of the Education Commission of the States, a report on various recommended agencies for national planning; briefed the Steering Committee of the Education Commission of the States on this project and the various proposed agencies.

16. Appraised the work of the major research and planning centers in the nation concerned with the future of higher education; interviewed their staffs with respect to planning-related activities in process or contemplated.

17. Assembled a list of topics requiring further study or research which have emerged from the seminars and contacts with a great many people and agencies around the country who are concerned with the future of higher education.

18. Solicited ideas on national planning from leaders of the group of college and university students that was assembled in mid-May by the U. S. Office of Education to discuss student involvement in USOE programs.

E

CONSULTANTS AND STAFF

National Planning for Higher Education

Consultants:

Dr. Chester M. Alter, Executive Director, Western Region, Academy for Educational Development; Chancellor Emeritus, University of Denver.

Dr. Robert H. Atwell, Vice Chancellor for Administration, The University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Dr. William J. Baumol, Professor, Department of Economics, Princeton University.

Dr. Louis Bender, Acting Assistant Commissioner, Office of Higher Education, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Dr. William G. Bowen, Provost, Princeton University.

Dr. Harvie Branscomb, Education Consultant, Academy for Educational Development; Chancellor Emeritus, Vanderbilt University.

Dr. James Douglas Brown, Jr., Dean, School of Business Administration, Adelphi University.

Dr. Paul G. Bulger, Professor of Higher Education, State University of New York at Albany; formerly Associate Commissioner for Higher and Professional Education, New York State; President, SUNY College at Buffalo.

Dr. Allan M. Cartter, Chancellor, New York University; formerly Vice President, American Council on Education.

Dr. Douglass Cater, Senior Advisor, Academy for Educational Development; formerly Special Assistant to the President of the United States.

Dr. Lawrence E. Dennis, Chancellor, Board of Trustees of State Colleges of Rhode Island; formerly Regional Representative, Ford Foundation; Director of Commission on Academic Affairs, American Council on Education.

Dr. Joseph W. Fordyce, President, Santa Fe Junior College.

Dr. Lyman A. Glenny, Associate Director, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley; formerly Associate Director, Board of Higher Education, State of Illinois.

Dr. Robert Haveman, Senior Economist, Joint Economic Committee, United States Congress.

Dr. Albert E. Holland, Vice President, Wellesley College; formerly President, Hobart and William Smith Colleges; Vice President, Trinity College.

Dr. Eugene H. Kleinpell, President Emeritus, Wisconsin State University, River Falls.

Dr. Jerome E. Lord, Senior Research Associate, Academy for Educational Development; formerly Assistant to the Vice Chancellor, City University of New York.

Dr. Leland L. Medsker, Director, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education; Professor of Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Dr. Ernest G. Palola, The Center For Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Dr. James G. Paltridge, The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Dr. Alice M. Rivlin, Economic Studies Program, The Brookings Institution; formerly Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Raymond Schultz, Professor of Higher Education, Florida State University.

Mr. Roger D. Semerad, Director, Office of Federal Programs, American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Mr. George M. Walton, formerly Executive Secretary, Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities.

Dr. James Wattenbarger, Director, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Florida; formerly Director of Junior Colleges, State of Florida.

Officers and Staff of the Academy:

Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, President.

Mr. Sidney G. Tickton, Executive Vice President

Mr. Rexford G. Moon, Jr., Vice President and Director of Studies.

Mr. Barry W. Schwenkmeyer, Assistant to the President.

Mr. John W. Malone, Writer.

F

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.

Board of Directors

Samuel M. Brownell, Chairman
Professor of Urban Educational Administration, Yale University Graduate School.

Alvin C. Eurich, President
Chairman, Educational Research and Development Division, FAS International; Chairman of the Board, Academy for Religion and Mental Health.

Sidney G. Tickton, Executive Vice President and Treasurer.

Joseph S. Iseman, Secretary
Partner, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison.

Robert O. Anderson
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Atlantic Richfield Company.

Fairfax M. Cone
Chairman, Board of Trustees, University of Chicago; Founder and Director, Foote, Cone & Belding.

Gilbert Granet
President, FAS International.

Robert V. Hansberger
President, Boise Cascade Corporation.

Theodore W. Kheel
Partner, Battle, Fowler, Stokes and Kheel.

Theodore Levitt
Professor of Business Administration, Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.

Louis B. Lundborg
Chairman of the Board, Bank of America.

Fred Ludekens
Chairman of the Board, FAS International.

Herbert R. Mayes
Director and Consultant, McCall Corporation; Director, Saturday Review; formerly President, McCall Corporation.

James A. McCain
President, Kansas State University.

John F. Merriam
Chairman of the Executive Committee, Northern Natural Gas Company.

Newton N. Minow
Senior Partner, Leibman, Williams, Bennett, Baird and Minow.

James O'Brien
Vice President and Director, Standard Oil Company of California.